Chapter 800 Restriction; Double Patenting

801 Introduction

The subject of restriction and double patenting are herein treated under U.S.C. Title 35, which became effective January 1, 1953, and the revised Rules of Practice that became effective January 1, 1953.

802 Basis for Practice in Statutes and Rules [R–45]

The basis for restriction and double patenting practice is found in the following statute and rules:

35 U.S.C. 121. Divisional applications. If two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in one application, the Commissioner may require the application to be restricted to one of the inventions. If the other invention is made the subject of a divisional application which complies with the requirements of section 120 of this title it shall be entitled to the benefit of the filing date of the original application. A patent issuing on an application with respect to which a requirement for restriction under this section has been made, or on an application filed as a result of such a requirement, shall not be used as a reference either in the Patent and Trademark Office or in the courts against a divisional application or against the original application or any patent issued on either of them, if the divisional application is filed before the issuance of the patent on the other application. If a divisional application is directed solely to subject matter described and claimed in the original application as filed, the Commissioner may dispense with signing and execution by the inventor. The validity of a patent shall not be questioned for failure of the Commissioner to require the application to be restricted to one invention.

Rule 141. Different inventions in one application. Two or more independent and distinct inventions may not be claimed in one application, except that more than one species of an invention, not to exceed five, may be specifically claimed in different claims in one application, provided the application also includes an allowable claim generic to all the claimed species and all the claims to each species in excess of one are written in dependent form (rule 75) or otherwise include all the limitations of the generic claim.

Rule 142. Requirement for restriction. (a) If two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in a single application, the examiner in his action shall require the applicant in his response to that action to elect that invention to which his claims shall be restricted, this official action being called a requirement for restriction (also known as a requirement for division). If the distinctness and independence of the inventions be clear, such requirement will be made before any action on the merits; however, it may be made at any time before final action in the case, at the discretion of the examiner.

(b) Claims to the invention or inventions not elected, if not cancelled, are nevertheless withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner by the election, subject however to reinstatement in the event the requirement for restriction is withdrawn or overruled.

Rules 141 through 146 outline Office practice on questions of restriction.

802.01 Meaning of "Independent", "Distinct" [R–45]

35 U.S.C. 121 quoted in the preceding section states that the Commissioner may require restriction if two or more "independent and distinct" inventions are claimed in one application. In rule 141 the statement is made that two or more "independent and distinct inventions" may not be claimed in one application.

This raises the question of the subjects as between which the Commissioner may require restriction. This in turn depends on the construction of the expression "independent and distinct" inventions.

"Independent," of course, means *not dependent.* If "distinct" means the same thing, then its use in the statute and in the rule is redundant. If "distinct" means something different, then the question arises as to what the difference in meaning between these two words may be. The hearings before the committees of Congress considering the codification of the patent laws indicate that section 121: "enacts as law existing practice with respect to division, at the same time introducing a number of changes."

The report on the hearings does not mention as a change that is introduced, the subjects between which the Commissioner may properly require division.

The term "independent" as already pointed out, means *not dependent.* A large number of subjects between which, prior to the 1952 Act, division had been proper, are dependent sub-